

I and II. Citing from MPEP § 808.01, the Office asserts that since the claims of Group I and Group II are not connected in design, operation or effect, the restriction of Group I and group II as unrelated is proper.

Applicants note that the claims of Group I are drawn to a method for preparing an asymmetric methacrylate crosslinking agent and the claims of Group II are drawn to a polymethacrylate polymer that contains a crosslinking agent prepared by the process of Group I. Applicants traverse the Office's restriction requirement noting that a process for producing a crosslinking agent and a crosslinked polymer containing the crosslinking agent may share a common element, namely an asymmetric methacrylate crosslinking agent.

Claims which share a common element may, of course, be related in design or effect. By not considering elements which may be shared between the Groups, the Office has improperly determined that the Groups are unrelated and the restriction requirement is not supportable.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

Applicants submit the above-identified application is now in condition for examination, and respectfully request timely notification of such action.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Stefan U. Koschmieder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 50,238



22850

Tel.: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
NFO/kst

I:\atty\suk\215503us-restr.doc